

### REMARKS

Claims 1-6, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected. No claims are amended.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

**Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakinami (5,892,855) in view of Suzuki (5,034,772).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The present invention, as defined in independent claim 1 and with reference to the non-limiting and exemplary embodiment that is illustrated in Fig. 1 and described at page 3 of the specification, is a sensor or camera in a window (1) that comprises a hood (10) and a sensor main body (4) that includes a lens (3) projecting within the hood (10). A part of the hood (10) is a breathable dustproof filter (11).

#### **Kakinami**

The Examiner points to the illustration in Fig. 1(b) of Kakinami of one or more cameras (16b, 26b, 36b) that are mounted within a passenger compartment of a vehicle and are connected to respective image processors (100, 200, 300). The first camera 16b is a wide view angle camera (col. 7, line 14), the second camera 26b is a standard view angle camera (col. 7, line 32) and the third camera 36b is a telescopic camera (col. 7, line 48). All three cameras are mounted on rotary mechanisms (16d, 26d, 36d) that are driven by electric motors and gear mechanisms (col. 7, lines 1-12).

Notably, none of the cameras is mounted within a "hood" of the type disclosed and claimed. The Examiner refers to Fig. 2 of Kakinami for a "hood" shown at the bottom of Fig. and refers to the disclosure at col. 7, lines 18-23. However, this is not a "hood" as disclosed and claimed since it is not (1) partitioned in consort with a car window from a vehicle compartment area, (2) does not include a lens projecting within and (3) does not include a dustproof filter on a part thereof. The hood to which the Examiner appears to refer is the engine hood. This is incorrect and provides one clear basis for distinction.

The Examiner expressly admits that Kakinami does not disclose that breathable dustproof filter that is provided on a part of the hood. The Examiner fails to acknowledge that the other characteristics of the hood are not present.

The Examiner looks to Suzuki for a teaching of a filter with regard to col. 3, lines 42-47.

**Suzuki**

Suzuki concerns an image forming apparatus, specifically an electrophotographic copying machine or printer (col. 1, lines 12-16). Such printer or copying machine is illustrated in Fig. 7. The Examiner refers to the illustration in Figs. 4A and 4B for the outer appearance of a T.H. sensor 8a, taken from a front and plan view, respectively. At col. 3, lines 42-47, Suzuki simply teaches that a temperature sensor TH<sub>1</sub> and a humidity sensor HU<sub>1</sub> are covered with a dustproof filter 20 and are mounted on a printed circuit board 21. However, there is no further teaching that any structure in Suzuki may be applicable to a vehicle, particularly, a sensor for mounting in a car window. The environment is totally different and the problems encountered that are overcome by use of a filter would be totally different in the two devices. Accordingly, Suzuki relates to an area of art that one of ordinary skill would not consider in identifying problems with the sensor for a vehicle or a solution thereof as taught by the Applicant.

Thus, on the basis that Kakinami does not teach the claimed structure and Suzuki does not remedy the deficiencies of Kakinami, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 also would be patentable for the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

**Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakinami (5,892,855) in view of Suzuki (5,034,772) and Fujii (5,922,105).** This rejection is traversed for the at least the following reasons.

Dependent claims 3 and 4 specify the particular type of dustproof filter as being a HEPA filter or ULPA filter. The Examiner notes that Fujii discloses a breathable dustproof filter that is a HEPA filter, at col. 3, lines 24-26. The Examiner also notes that Fujii discloses a breathable dustproof filter that is a ULPA filter at col. 3, lines 24-26.

Nothing in the cited references, however, remedies the deficiencies of the combination of Suzuki and Kakinami. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U. S. Application No. 10/004,840

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Alan J. Kasper/*

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 27, 2006